

Amendments To The Drawings:

The attached drawing sheets include changes to FIGS. 1-3. These sheets are requested to replace the original sheets of FIGS. 1-3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s) of FIGS. 1-3

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed January 4, 2006, the amendment that was filed November 25, 2005 was objected to as adding new matter. The drawings were also objected to as having copy machine marks and as having lettering that was less than 1/8 inch in height.

New figures are being submitted with this response, which are believed to overcome the Examiner's objections. Note however, that two figures have been drawn onto a single page. No new matter has been added by the new drawings.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 and ¶2 because of the new matter allegedly added to the specification. The specification has been amended as set forth above to delete reference to using light water as a coolant. The specification has also been amended, however, to correct translation errors. The Applicant submits that the fourth full paragraph on page 8, which is provided above, is an accurate translation of the original Chinese-language text of this paragraph. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Claim 5 was additionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 because the term "residual heat removal system" was considered by the Examiner to be unclear. The amendment to claim 5 set forth above recites that the residual heat cooler is comprised of an electromagnetic valve on a connection tube, thus, the rejection of claim 5 under §112, ¶2 is believed to be overcome.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Gruel. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) being unpatentable over Gruel in view of Gou et al., i.e., U.S. patent number 5,577,085. Claims 4 and 5 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Greul in view of Newton et al., i.e., U.S. patent number 5,268,942 and U.S. patent number 3,309,278 to Dickson.

As for the rejection of claim 1 under §102, the Examiner admits that Greul does not disclose the pressurizer recited in claim 1. The Examiner nevertheless continued the rejection of claim 1 and cited US patent 2,714,577 to show that the CANDU reactor taught by Gruel *inherently* taught the pressurizer recited in claim 1.

Among other limitations that have been added, claim 1 now recites that light water is used as both a coolant and as a moderator for the claimed reactor. The Applicant submits that Greul does *not* teach a reactor wherein light water is used to both cool the reactor and as a reaction moderator. Thus, claim 1 as amended avoids the Greul reference.


In Greul, there are two cooling circuits. Heavy water (D₂O) must be used as a reaction moderator and can also be used as a coolant, but H₂O is used only as coolant and cannot be used as a moderator. Thus, Greul does not anticipate claim 1 as amended. As for the '577 secondary reference cited by the Examiner, it too does not show light water used as both moderator and a coolant, thus, claim 1 as amended avoids this references as well.

Since claim 1 as amended avoids the prior art and is now in condition for allowance claims 2-5, which depend from claim 1, are also in condition for allowance.

Since the Examiner's objections to the specification are believed to have been overcome and since the claim rejections are believed to have been traversed, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5 are in now condition for allowance and therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 12, 2006



Joseph F. Krause, Reg. No. 32,578
Ladas & Parry
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300